

UCLA Faculty Association

News and opinion from Dan Mitchell since 2009

[Home](#)[About](#)

Saturday, November 15, 2025

No Billion



From the [LA Times](#): A federal judge on Friday blocked the Trump administration from imposing a \$1.2-billion fine on UCLA along with stipulations for deep campus changes in exchange for being eligible for federal grants. The decision is a major win for universities that have struggled to resist President Trump's attempt to discipline "very bad" universities that he claims have mistreated Jewish

students, forcing them to pay exorbitant fines and agree to adhere to conservative standards...

"The administration and its executive agencies are engaged in a concerted campaign to purge 'woke,' 'left,' and 'socialist' viewpoints from our country's leading universities," [U.S. District Judge Rita F.] Lin wrote in her opinion... Defendants submit nothing to refute this. "It is undisputed," Lin added, "that this precise playbook is now being executed at the University of California." ...

Lin's injunction is not the final say on the case... The government... could appeal to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals as it has done for other cases...

Full story at <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2025-11-14/federal-judge-blocks-trump-administration-from-imposing-billion-fine-ucla>.

Posted by California Policy Issues at [10:53 AM](#) No comments:

Labels: [academic freedom](#), [diversity](#), [politics](#), [UC](#), [UCLA](#)

Not Everyone Is Prepared



UC-San Diego finds that many admitted undergraduates are not prepared for college-level work:

Senate-Administration Workgroup on Admissions Final Report, November 6, 2025

Executive summary

Over the past five years, UC San Diego has experienced a steep decline in the academic preparation of its entering first-year students -- particularly in mathematics, but also in writing and language skills. Between 2020 and 2025, the number of students whose math skills fall below middle-school level increased nearly thirtyfold,

reaching roughly one in eight members of the entering cohort. This deterioration coincided with the COVID-19 pandemic and its effects on education, the elimination of standardized testing, grade inflation, and the expansion of admissions from under-resourced high schools. The combination of these factors has produced an incoming class increasingly unprepared for the quantitative and analytical rigor expected at UC San Diego.

The Senate-Administration Working Group on Admissions (SAWG) concludes that this trend poses serious challenges both to student success and to the university's instructional mission. Admitting large numbers of underprepared students risks harming those students and straining limited instructional resources. The report offers a series of recommendations to improve the alignment between admissions practices, student readiness, and available support systems.

Key Recommendations

1. Addressing the Math Preparation Crisis

- Develop and implement a Math Index to predict students' likelihood of placement into remedial math, using historical placement data and transcript-based variables (coursework, grades, high school attended).
- Use the Math Index in matching students with majors to ensure that the number of students requiring Math 2/3B remains within manageable limits, with an initial target of no more than 300

The Council of UC Faculty Associations

- [Fight for the Future of Higher Education: Academic Freedom from the Classroom to the Clinic](#)
- [Our Concerns Over Revisions to APMs 15 and 16](#)
- [Fight for the Future of Higher Ed Town Hall](#)
- [Letter from AAUP to UC Objecting to Trellix](#)
- [Judge rules Trump demands of UCLA must be made public](#)

Remaking the University

- [Liner Note 43. Caring for Austerity](#) - 11/30/2025
- [MLA and BDS 9: Letter by Liron Mor Declining 2025 Scaglione Prize for Comparative Literary Studies \(Guest Post\)](#) - 11/26/2025
- [Anatomy of a Fall: The Case of Indiana University \(Guest Post\)](#) - 11/20/2025

Higher Ed. News & Commentary

- [Chronicle of Higher Education](#)
- [Inside Higher Education](#)
- [Remaking the University](#)
- [Changing Universities](#)
- [California Professor](#)

Search This Blog

UC Faculty Associations

- [UCLA Faculty Association](#)
- [UCSB Faculty Association](#)
- [UCSC Faculty Association](#)
- [UCB Faculty Association](#)
- [Council of UC Faculty Associations](#)

Other Faculty Organizations

- [American Association of University Professors](#)
- [California Faculty Association \(NEA\)](#)
- [UC-AFT](#)

Topics

[politics](#) (2278) [UC](#) (2073) [UC Regents](#) (1876) [health care](#) (1418) [State Budget](#) (1265) [governor](#) (1114) [UC budget crisis](#) (964) [diversity](#) (922) [UC-Berkeley](#) (902) [pension](#) (659) [pensions](#) (589) [admissions](#) (538) [tuition](#) (527) [athletics](#) (518) [CSU](#) (407) [transportation](#) (389) [UC-Davis](#) (374) [online education](#) (338) [UCOP](#) (308) [uc retirement](#) (301) [ucrp](#) (300) [traffic](#) (293) [audio](#) (291) [new](#) [hotel-](#)

first-year students in these courses by 2026–27.

- Reassess math requirements by major, ensuring that degree pathways align with actual quantitative demands and that applicants are clearly informed of differences between B.A. and B.S. programs.
- Require early summer math placement testing (by June 1) for all incoming students needing math for their major, to enable timely remediation before fall enrollment.
- Bring admissions levels from under-resourced (LCFF+) into alignment with those of similarly selective UC campuses while maintaining equity and access goals.
- Establish feedback mechanisms with high schools -- especially those with persistent mismatches between student grades and placement results -- to address curriculum quality and grade inflation.

2. Improving Writing and Literacy Assessment

- Commission a dedicated campus study on writing and literacy preparedness, engaging humanities and writing program faculty, library experts, and specialists in communication across disciplines.
- Develop or adopt a more predictive assessment of writing and language skills to be used in admissions, moving beyond GPA and course titles to evaluate readiness for college-level work.

3. Strengthening the Holistic Review and Selection Process

- Integrate the Math Index and improved literacy indicators into holistic review for majors requiring high analytical or quantitative skills.
- Enhance cross-unit communication between academic departments, Enrollment Management, and the Committee on Admissions (CoA), ensuring faculty input earlier in the admissions cycle and feedback after each cycle.

4. Clarifying the Role of Portfolios in Arts Admissions

- Improve transparency by ensuring feedback loops between Admissions, the Dean's Office, and departments, so that faculty reviewers receive information about outcomes for applicants they evaluated.

5. Reaffirming Faculty Oversight through the Committee on Admissions. The Committee on Admissions should assume a proactive leadership role in shaping and evaluating admissions policies. Specifically, CoA should:

- Oversee the implementation and annual recalibration of the Math Index.
- Collaborate with Enrollment Management to evaluate correlations between Holistic Review scores, placement results, and student outcomes.

6. Systemwide Recommendations

- UC San Diego's representative on BOARS should advocate for a systemwide reexamination of standardized testing, as many peer institutions have already done.

- BOARS should also investigate disparities in high school grading standards and develop a UC-wide response to ensure fair and reliable admissions evaluation.

Full report at <https://senate.ucsd.edu/media/740347/sawg-report-on-admissions-review-docs.pdf>.

====

NOTE: It seems unlikely that UC-San Diego is the only UC campus with this problem.

Posted by California Policy Issues at [3:30 AM](#) No comments: 

Labels: [admissions](#), [UC-San Diego](#)

Straws in the Wind - Part 162

From [Inside Higher Ed](#): *Faculty at all Florida public universities must now make syllabi, as well as a list of required or recommended textbooks and instructional materials for each class, available online and searchable for students and the general public for five years. The new policy is part of an amendment to the Florida Board of Governors' regulation on "Textbook and Instructional Materials Affordability and Transparency," and it passed unanimously without discussion at a board meeting Thursday. On the agenda item description, board officials cited improved transparency as the impetus for the rule, which is meant to help students "make informed decisions as they select courses." But some faculty members say it's designed to chill academic freedom and allow the public to police what professors teach in the classroom.*



...According to the approved amendment, professors must post the syllabi "as early as is feasible" but no fewer than 45 days prior to the start of class. Public syllabi must include "course curriculum, required and recommended textbooks and instructional materials, goals and student expectations of the course, and how student performance will be measured and evaluated, including the grading scale." Individualized courses like independent study and theses are exempt from the rule. The Florida Board of Governors did not respond to Inside Higher Ed's questions about the amended policy, including a question about when it will start being enforced.

[conference center](#) (282) [UC enrollment](#) (281) [enrollment](#) (257) [UC-San Diego](#) (256) [community colleges](#) (238) [LAO](#) (226) [UC-Irvine](#) (183) [fund raising](#) (167) [UC-San Francisco](#) (159) [UC-Santa Barbara](#) (159) [UC-Santa Cruz](#) (156) [controller](#) (148) [faculty center](#) (144) [UC-Riverside](#) (140) [ballot propositions](#) (132) [CalPERS](#) (122) [UC-Merced](#) (114) [faculty pay](#) (109) [Master Plan](#) (102) [Yudof](#) (90) [UCRS retirement](#) (62) [parking](#) (61) [Faculty Association at UCLA](#) (60) [privatization](#) (59) [CalSTRS](#) (50) [UC Berkeley](#) (35) [copyright](#) (34) [campus climate survey](#) (28) [UCRS](#) (22) [Michigan Model](#) (18) [UC Merced](#) (17) [uc funding](#) (16) [Regents](#) (15) [State Contribution](#) (14) [UCOF](#) (14) [faculty recruitment](#) (12) [UC pay](#) (7) [graduate education](#) (6) [UC San Diego](#) (5) [UC Irvine](#) (3) [UCPolitics](#) (3) [teaching evaluation](#) (3) [UC Santa Cruz](#) (2)

Blog Archive

▼ 2025 (1046)

▼ November (108)

[The Northwestern Deal](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 177](#)

[Watch the Afternoon Regents Meeting of Nov. 19, 2025](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 176](#)

[Funding Squeeze](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 175](#)

[Happy Thanksgiving: Then and Now](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 174](#)

[Bugged - Part 3](#)

[Watch the Morning Regents Meeting of Nov. 19, 2025](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 173](#)

[\(Possible\) Strike News](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 172](#)

[Tower](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 171](#)

[Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 94](#)

[News of Ratification](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 170](#)

[Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 93](#)

[Lawsuit Targets UC, Others](#)

[Watch the Regents Health Services Committee Meetin...](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 169](#)

[Letter from the Prez](#)

[Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 92](#)

[Romance?](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 168](#)

[State Budget Outlook](#)

[Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 91](#)

[Uncancelled - And then postponed](#)

[Going Up](#)

[Makarechian on value of UC and of immigrants](#)

[Cancelled](#)

[Economics 1 - Just saying...](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 167](#)

[Theater Revival](#)

[Burnett](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 166](#)

[Statements - Part 2](#)

[Continued Receipts Above Estimate](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 165](#)

...It's not a unique policy, even in Florida. Since 2013, the University of Florida has required professors to post their syllabi online—but only three days prior to the start of class, and they have to remain publicly available for just three semesters. Now, all Florida public universities, including the University of Florida, must follow the new rules. A UF spokesperson told Inside Higher Ed the university is waiting for the Board of Governors to share guidance about when the new policy will be enforced.

...Texas similarly requires all faculty at public institutions to make a version of their syllabus public. Indiana implemented a law in July requiring public institutions to publish all course syllabi on their websites, and this fall, the University System of Georgia introduced a new policy requiring faculty to post syllabi and curriculum vitae on institution websites. Some faculty members in those states have seen firsthand the risks of posting syllabi online; several professors have been harassed and doxed over course content in their online syllabi...

Full story at <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/faculty-issues/teaching/2025/11/10/fla-board-says-syllabi-reading-lists-must-be-posted>.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:20 AM No comments: 

Labels: [academic freedom](#), [Indiana University](#), [politics](#), [U of Florida](#), [U of Georgia](#), [U of Texas](#)

Rumors - Part 2



The Legislative Assembly met on Thursday and, among other issues, it discussed the two resolutions reproduced below. Voting on such resolutions is done electronically and it takes a bit of time for the Academic Senate to tally the votes.*

Rumor has it that no opposition was expressed. So that might indicate how the votes will come out. We await the tabulation.

November 2025

Submitted by:

Aparna Bhaduri, Assistant Professor of Biological Chemistry; Salmaan Craig, Associate Professor of Architecture and Urban Design; Andrea Goldman, Associate Professor of History; Choon Hwee Koh, Assistant Professor of History; Gregory Leazer, Associate Professor of Information Studies

Executive Summary

This resolution reaffirms the Academic Senate's statutory role in campus budget oversight under Regental Bylaw 40 and UCLA Divisional Bylaw 65.3. It calls for full disclosure of UCLA's 2024–25 and 2025–26 budgets, transparency regarding the reported \$300 million deficit, and documentation of reallocations affecting campus units. Drawing on the 2009 Budget Planning Principles, the 2024 Best Practices for Divisional CPBs, and the 2025 CPB Budgetary Environment memorandum, it seeks to restore meaningful shared governance through the release of budget data, the implementation of CPB's recommended consultative structures, and a renewed Senate-led articulation of principles for financial decision-making during periods of fiscal disruption.

Resolution on Financial Transparency and the Restoration of Shared Governance in Budget Planning

1. Whereas Regental Bylaw 40 and UCLA Divisional Bylaw 65.3 assign the Academic Senate a central advisory role in campus planning and budgetary matters, indicating that the administration provide timely and complete financial information to enable informed consultation and that the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) and the Executive Board (EB) are the primary advisory bodies to the Academic Senate on matters of planning, budget and administration;

2. Whereas the University Committee on Planning and Budget's Best Practices for Divisional CPBs (November 2023) and the Principles to Guide Fiscal Decision-Making in the Current Budget Environment (May 2009) affirm that transparency, early consultation, and shared information are essential to the integrity of shared governance;

3. Whereas the UCPB Report on Divisional-CPB Best Practices identifies six goals that define the UC systemwide standard for effective shared governance in planning and budget:

- 1) information sharing and transparency in all budget matters;
- 2) oversight of operating budgets and resource allocation for individual units;
- 3) timely participation in long-term strategic planning;
- 4) regular consultation between CPB and campus leadership;
- 5) training and maintenance of institutional knowledge; and
- 6) dissemination of financial information to the broader campus community;

These goals collectively entail that CPB receive predictable and advance access to relevant budget information before reviews are undertaken, to ensure meaningful and timely

[Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 90](#)

[Statements](#)

[Overwhelming votes](#)

[Two](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 164](#)

[Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 89](#)

[The Lease](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 163](#)

[New Notice](#)

[No Billion](#)

[Not Everyone Is Prepared](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 162](#)

[Rumors - Part 2](#)

[Athletic Investments - Part 4](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 161](#)

[Lane Squeeze Near UCLA This Weekend](#)

[Last Minute](#)

[Revitalizing Westwood](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 160](#)

[I never promised you a Rose Bowl? - Part 2](#)

[Bugged - Part 2](#)

[No thank you](#)

[Bugged](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 159](#)

[Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 88](#)

[Averted Strike News](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 158](#)

[You Don't Say](#)

[All in 30 Minutes? - Part 2](#)

[Special Systemwide Assembly Meeting: Nov. 20, 2025...](#)

[Naming](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 157](#)

[Cosmetic Compacts](#)

[Reminder - Don't Choose What's Not on the Menu](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 156](#)

[Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 87](#)

[The Regents are Coming: Nov. 18-20, 2025](#)

[Coming Soon to Berkeley](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 155](#)

[Two Suits Settled](#)

[Cornell Deal](#)

[Angry Judge](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 154](#)

[Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 86](#)

[Holmby](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 153](#)

[The End](#)

[Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 85](#)

[Assessing Options](#)

[Rumors](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 152](#)

[I never promised you a Rose Bowl?](#)

[They don't quite say don't give it](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 151](#)

[Animals](#)

[Athletic Investments - Part 3](#)

[In Case You Missed It](#)

[Straws in the Wind - Part 150](#)

[Special](#)

[Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 84](#)

consultation;

4. Whereas the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) has not provided the Academic Senate or its Council on Planning and Budget with full written or digital budget statements for fiscal years 2024–25 and 2025–26, nor with the data necessary to understand the reported \$300 million campus deficit, including statements of revenues, expenditures, reserves, and the definition and composition of said deficit;

5. Whereas academic units across the campus have reported disruptions to their budget processes without adequate explanation regarding their appropriations, thereby impeding the Senate's capacity to exercise its statutory advisory role and to ensure that budget allocations align with academic priorities;

6. Whereas the Council on Planning and Budget's CPB Recommendations to Executive Board on Budget Priorities (April 2024) memorandum documents that these disruptions, coupled with the lack of data sharing and analyses, have impeded CPB's ability to provide informed advice as indicated by Senate bylaws—issues that become especially critical during a budget crisis—thereby weakening shared governance and diminishing faculty participation in decisions affecting UCLA's academic priorities;

7. Whereas this absence of transparency and consultation undermines financial accountability, shifts burdens to Senate faculty to seek extramural funds to address deficits, and weakens the University's ability to uphold its core academic missions of teaching, research, and service;

8. Be it therefore resolved that the Legislative Assembly requests that the Chief Financial Officer and other relevant administrative officers immediately release to the Council on Planning and Budget and to the Executive Board comprehensive financial statements for fiscal years 2024–25 and 2025–26, including statements of revenues, expenditures, reserves, and a clear definition and accounting of the reported deficit;

9. Be it further resolved that the Chief Financial Officer and other relevant administrative officers provide detailed documentation of all reallocations or transfers of funds from campus units, specifying the sources, amounts, and uses of those funds;

10. Be it further resolved that the Chief Financial Officer and other relevant administrative officers work collaboratively with the Council on Planning and Budget to strengthen communication and consultation with the Senate by implementing the Systemwide Academic Senate Best Practices for Divisional Committees on Planning and Budget, as requested in the CPB Budgetary Environment 2024–2025 memorandum but not yet undertaken, including the specific steps outlined on page 2 of the May 29, 2025 memo—training for CPB members, quarterly meetings with the Chancellor and EVCP, an annual campuswide budget town hall, regular CPB–CFO consultations, and end-of year CPB reporting—and that this collaboration produce by December 13, 2025 a public report establishing a recurring, transparent process of consultation consistent with Senate policy;

11. Be it further resolved that the Council on Planning and Budget and the Executive Board, drawing on the precedent of the Academic Senate's 2009 Principles to Guide Fiscal Decision-Making in the Current Budget Environment, prepare a joint report articulating principles to guide fiscal decision-making during the current period of financial uncertainty, to be circulated to the Senate and campus leadership by February 2026, thereby renewing the Senate's role in defining the values and standards that should govern future budgetary planning and administrative consultation;

12. Be it finally resolved that the Legislative Assembly requests that the Chief Financial Officer and other relevant administrative officers provide, in consultation with the Council on Planning and Budget and the Executive Board, detailed analyses and forward projections addressing:

i. the impact of reductions in state funding, identified at the recent town hall by the CFO as the primary factor underlying the structural deficit;

ii. anticipated changes in federal funding across campus programs and research portfolios, recognizing that such developments are determined at the Regents level; iii. potential reductions in federal grants and their downstream effects on campus operations;

iv. projected impacts of graduate student researcher (GSR) wage increases;

v. past and anticipated changes in campus debt service obligations;

vi. costs and status of recent real estate acquisitions, including expenditures needed to bring new properties into active use;

vii. expenditures and commitments associated with campus-wide technology initiatives such as One IT and the integration of artificial intelligence tools;

viii. recent and current agreements with external consulting firms; and

ix. trends in the growth of administrative budgets relative to academic expenditures—and that these analyses be transmitted to the Council on Planning and Budget and the Executive Board in time to inform deliberations for the 2026–27 budget cycle.

Source: https://dms.senate.ucla.edu/~councils.and.committees/meeting_view.cfm?V=924C501AB5F6BFA2D5647E97D91DB0E5E28EC8AB85538A89FBE5C867391F7C638EE301C8EB230D9C (actual pages 248-250)

=====

November 2025

Submitted by:

Isabella Arzeno-Soltero, Assistant Professor in Civil and Environmental Engineering; Matthew Fisher, Associate Professor of English; Kaily Heitz, Assistant Professor of Geography; Jennifer Jay, Professor in Civil and Environmental Engineering; Gregory Leazer, Associate Professor of Information Studies; Greg Okin, Professor and Chair of Geography

- September (116)
- August (115)
- July (101)
- June (96)
- May (85)
- April (81)
- March (83)
- February (76)
- January (81)

- 2024 (832)
- 2023 (828)
- 2022 (719)
- 2021 (710)
- 2020 (914)
- 2019 (671)
- 2018 (595)
- 2017 (666)
- 2016 (715)
- 2015 (765)
- 2014 (704)
- 2013 (776)
- 2012 (839)
- 2011 (738)
- 2010 (431)
- 2009 (12)

Contributors

- [California Policy Issues](#)
- [Toby Higbie](#)
- [UCLA Faculty Association](#)

Executive Summary

This resolution reaffirms the Academic Senate's statutory authority and responsibility under Regents' Bylaw 40, Standing Order 105.2, and UCLA Bylaw 50.4 to participate in decisions affecting the University's research and teaching mission. It responds to the breakdown of consultation and oversight in campus information technology (IT) initiatives, including the One IT consolidation. Drawing on the IS-3 Electronic Information Security Policy, the 2016 Data Governance Task Force Report, and the 2022 CDITP Shared Governance Recommendations, it calls for a pause in One IT, academic impact assessments for new IT projects, disclosure of costs, and the establishment of a permanent Joint Governance Committee on Academic Information Technology and Data to ensure transparency, accountability, and shared governance in all future IT decisions.

Resolution on Information Technology Accountability, Transparency, and Shared Governance

1. Whereas under Regents' Bylaw 40 and Standing Order 105.2, the Academic Senate has the authority and responsibility to participate in the formulation and administration of University policy, particularly in matters that directly affect teaching, research, and public service;
2. Whereas the UCLA Academic Senate Bylaws, including Bylaw 75.5 (Committee on Data, Information Technology, and Privacy), assign to the Senate advisory responsibility for information technology and data-related decisions that bear upon the academic mission;
3. Whereas the University of California's IS-3 Electronic Information Security Policy identifies as its governing principle that information security practices must enable the academic mission and ensure that risk management occurs in proportion to academic and research needs;
4. Whereas the 2016 UCLA Data Governance Task Force Report and the May 2022 Committee on Data, Information Technology, and Privacy (CDITP) Recommendations on IT Shared Governance both affirmed that effective IT governance necessitates formal, ongoing faculty participation; called for a balanced joint Senate–Administration Board on Privacy and Data Protection; and recommended the establishment of structured consultation procedures, public documentation of IT decisions, and meaningful faculty representation on all major campus IT governance bodies—recommendations that remain unimplemented;
5. Whereas the September 7, 2025 Letter from UCLA Chairs and Directors Regarding One IT warned that the initiative, announced without consultation during the summer, would “put faculty research and teaching programs at risk” and urged that “UCLA faculty, through the appropriate Senate governance structures, [should] assess the proposal’s potential benefits and risks,” and called for a pause on its implementation, and whereas the October 8, 2025 response from EVCP Hunt and the October 21, 2025 town hall with AVC Michael Beck and CIO Lucy Avetisyan did not meaningfully or substantially address the concerns of faculty regarding the One IT administrative initiative;*
6. Whereas multiple campus-wide technology projects in recent years have been marked by delayed implementation, escalating costs, and inadequate oversight—revealing systemic weaknesses in governance, communication, and accountability for initiatives that directly affect the research and teaching mission of the University, and reducing trust and confidence for future administrative projects;
7. Whereas the UC Assembly of the Academic Senate, on June 12, 2025, adopted a systemwide Resolution on Use of **Trellix** and Similar Monitoring Software calling for its suspension because of the threat it poses to academic freedom, privacy, and research integrity, and yet as of November 2025 there has been no formal response from UC President Milliken or UC CIO Van Williams, a silence that further erodes faculty trust and underscores the breakdown of transparent engagement between UC leadership and the Academic Senate;
8. Be it resolved that the administration pauses implementation of One IT until it addresses the concerns raised by faculty about the initiative; that they reverse the transfer of IT staff reporting lines from academic units to central administration undertaken unilaterally without faculty advice or consent; and that all new campus IT plans include a formal academic impact assessment evaluating their potential effects on research, teaching, and faculty governance before implementation;
9. Be it resolved that UCLA ensures that all faculty have the opportunity to meaningfully participate in the assessment, design, and implementation of any One IT initiatives, and that new procedures be established to guarantee substantive Senate authority and responsibility in decisions affecting teaching, research, and service;
10. Be it resolved that CIO Avetisyan and AVC Beck provide data by December 1, 2025, substantiating the claim that One IT will increase “equity”;
11. Be it resolved that the Chancellor and appropriate administrative officers disclose the total costs associated with recent campus-wide technology initiatives, **including the Ascend project****, explain how administrative oversight will be restructured to prevent recurrence of governance failures, and identify how accountability will be ensured for future IT projects and restore trust;
12. Be it finally resolved that the administration and the Academic Senate, through CDITP, the Committee on Committees, and the Executive Board, establish a balanced Joint Governance Committee on Academic Information Technology and Data—building upon the unimplemented recommendations of the 2016 Data Governance Task Force Report and the 2022 CDITP Shared Governance Recommendations—to oversee campus IT and data initiatives, ensure early and substantive Senate participation in all major IT decisions, require that future projects align with the University's research and teaching mission, with durable Senate authority and responsibility in policy development and day-to-day governance of academic computing.

Source: https://dms.senate.ucla.edu/~councils.and.committees/meeting_view.cfm?V=924C501AB5F6BFA2D5647E97D91DB0E5E28EC8AB85538A89FBE5C867391F7C638EE301C8EB230D9C (actual pages 251-252)

====

*We previously took note of the budget-related resolution:

<https://uclafacultyassociation.blogspot.com/2025/11/rumors.html>.

**<https://strategic-plan.ucla.edu/one-ii/>.

***<https://uclafacultyassociation.blogspot.com/2025/05/do-i-sense-computer-snafu-part-3.html>.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:05 AM No comments: 

Labels: UCLA

Friday, November 14, 2025

Athletic Investments - Part 4

As blog readers will know, the UC Regents in a closed-door session seem to favor an "investment" of pension and/or endowment funds - the outlines of which are not clear - into some kind of Big Ten athletic conference enterprise. We have noted that as trustees of these funds, the Regents have an obligation to act in the best interest of those funds. Using them for the purpose of fostering the athletic programs of UC - really UCLA in this case - raises a host of questions.*

We are not the only source of these questions:

An Open Letter to the Trustees and Regents of Big Ten Institutions

November 10, 2025

By Michael B. Poliakoff, President, American Council of Trustees and Alumni

To the Regents and Trustees of Big Ten Member Institutions:

Recent reports that the Big Ten Conference is moving toward a vote on a \$2.4 billion private-equity transaction with UC Investments, the investment arm of the University of California system, demand your immediate attention as fiduciaries. As a fellow governing board member and as a president of a national organization whose mission is to support higher education accountability through engaged trusteeship, I have serious concerns about the process behind this proposal. These concerns have critical implications not just for college athletics, but for the integrity of American higher education writ large.

A university's board exists to serve as the ultimate guardian of its mission, integrity, and assets. That stewardship includes oversight and final authority over all material university decisions and resources, including those related to intercollegiate athletics. Effectively selling or transferring an athletic department's most valuable rights—its media, branding, or commercial assets—is unquestionably a material institutional decision requiring board oversight.

All governing board members, whether they are called trustees, regents or visitors, have a responsibility to ensure that America's institutions act in the best interests of all stakeholders, especially the public. And yet there is a credible claim that governing boards have received insufficient information to make any such determination with respect to the Big Ten Enterprises proposal. This would be a shocking lack of transparency given the stakes of this transaction.

This is not how responsible governance functions. Boards cannot discharge their fiduciary duties without having access to the full text of any proposed agreement, sufficient time to study its implications, and a formal role in authorizing or declining their institution's participation before a binding vote is cast.

By bypassing their governing boards, the Big Ten universities risk undermining the legitimacy of any decision and eroding confidence in their leadership.

To restore integrity to this process, we urge each governing board to adopt a clear resolution requiring that:

- The university president or chancellor abstain from any Big Ten vote on the proposed transaction until his or her governing board has been fully briefed;
- The board is provided with all relevant documents, analyses, and legal opinions; and
- The board has formally authorized the president or chancellor to vote on behalf of the institution.

Furthermore, the Big Ten's governance structure should be amended to ensure that boards of trustees and regents are not merely informed but serve as the ultimate authorities on any future decision involving the sale, transfer, or monetization of university-owned athletic assets.

The universities of the Big Ten have earned global respect for their commitment to integrity, excellence, and public trust. That trust now rests on whether their governing boards will insist upon proper oversight in a moment of historic consequence.

As stewards of these great institutions, trustees and regents must not permit others to act on their behalf without clear authorization. The process must change so that the boards, and only the boards, hold final authority over this matter.

Respectfully,

Michael B. Poliakoff

President, ACTA

Source: <https://www.goacta.org/2025/11/an-open-letter-to-the-trustees-and-regents-of-big-ten-institutions/>.



===

*<https://uclafacultyassociation.blogspot.com/2025/11/athletic-investments-part-3.html>; <https://uclafacultyassociation.blogspot.com/2025/10/athletic-investments-part-2.html>; <https://uclafacultyassociation.blogspot.com/2025/10/athletic-investments.html>.

===

Further background:

From *Yahoo Sports*: *Big Ten executives are socializing a plan with member schools to move forward with their capital investment proposal — even without Michigan and USC. The league has signaled to schools that it may hold a vote in two weeks to potentially adopt a 20-year, \$2.4 billion deal with a California pension fund and extend the conference grant of rights an additional 10 years in what would be an unprecedented decision from a major conference — striking a membership extension without all of its current schools. The move for a vote, supported and encouraged by many university administrators at 16 Big Ten schools, threatens to drive a schism within the league — between those supportive universities and the Wolverines and Trojans, who are not in support of the measure.*

Several university administrators, board members and industry executives spoke to Yahoo Sports under condition of anonymity about the Big Ten's latest proposal in partnering with an investment fund of the University of California pension system called UC Investments. In messages sent to Michigan and USC, the Big Ten has signaled that it is moving forward with the deal, even delivering to each program a proposed deadline for their decision. If they don't agree to the deal, the schools may lose the additional capital as part of the landmark proposal and risk their future within the conference beyond 2036, the current end of the existing grant-of-rights agreement. League officials are socializing a specific date — Nov. 21 — for a vote on the capital investment proposal.

Administrators and board members at both Michigan and USC were informed earlier this week that, if a 16-school agreement is reached, the two programs would be granted a grace period — three to six months — to agree to join the deal if they wish to reap the full financial benefits. That period is only a proposal for now...

In public comments made last month, University of Michigan trustees described the deal as a "payday loan" and called it an unnecessary step and a "bail out" for those Big Ten schools that have mismanaged their finances. While those at USC have kept their feelings more private, Trojans athletic director Jen Cohen and her university board members hold reservations about an agreement that, for one, would distribute more revenue to league members Ohio State, Michigan and Penn State than all other schools...

Full story at <https://sports.yahoo.com/college-football/breaking-news/article/sources-big-ten-execs-pressing-to-make-24-billion-investment-deal-without-michigan-and-usc-if-needed-140045573.html>.

NOTE: Is anyone going to raise this issue at the upcoming meeting of the UC Regents Investments Committee?

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:30 AM No comments: 

Labels: athletics, endowment, pension, UC Regents

Straws in the Wind - Part 161

From *Inside Higher Ed*: *House Republicans have accused George Mason University president Gregory Washington of lying to Congress about diversity practices at his institution, ratcheting up pressure on the president to step down. The Republican-led House Judiciary Committee alleged in a report... that Washington made "multiple false statements to Congress" in testimony about diversity, equity and inclusion efforts at GMU. The public university has been under fire for months over allegedly illegal DEI practices as the Trump administration has sought to crack down on such initiatives, claiming they are discriminatory and violate federal civil rights law. The Judiciary Committee report also alleged that the university "likely violated federal civil rights law by discriminating based on race in its hiring practices to advance Dr. Washington's diversity, equity, and inclusion initiative."*



Washington has denied breaking the law through efforts to diversify GMU's faculty and staff, telling Congress that the university did not practice illegal discrimination under his leadership... The House Judiciary Committee's report zoomed in on an effort by GMU, launched shortly after Washington took office in July 2020, to diversify employee ranks. The Anti-Racism and Inclusive Excellence initiative the president introduced aimed to make faculty and staff "mirror student demographics" at GMU, which is among the most diverse institutions in the country. As part of that effort, GMU tasked schools and departments with hiring more underrepresented individuals. But in congressional testimony, Washington denied the initiative was a strict mandate.

...The House Judiciary Committee claimed Washington lied about that... Congress pointed to testimony from Ken Randall, the dean of George Mason University's Antonin Scalia Law School, as evidence that Washington lied about the plan being optional. "You'd get fired if you didn't have a plan," Randall said, according to an interview transcript.

Washington also denied the administration formally reviewed plans to diversify faculty hiring. Republicans accused him of lying about that, too, pointing to internal remarks from then-vice president of diversity, equity and inclusion Sharnnia Artis (who now has a different title), in

which she said the DEI team "consistently reviewed, monitored, and supported" such plans. "Again, the evidence contradicts Dr. Washington's testimony," the report states...

...The GMU Board of Visitors has said little in the immediate aftermath of the report... While the board is reviewing the report, it appears unlikely members would be able to take action against Washington. GMU's board, which is stocked with GOP donors and political figures appointed by Republican governor Glenn Youngkin, is currently without a quorum after Virginia Democrats blocked multiple appointments in recent months. Now a legal battle over those blocked appointments is slowly winding its way through the judicial system. While the Virginia Supreme Court heard arguments in the case last month, it has yet to issue a ruling on the matter. In the meantime, with only six of its 16 seats filled, GMU's board is hobbled...

Full story at <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/government/politics-elections/2025/11/07/congress-accuses-gmu-president-lying-about-dei>Youngkin's.

Posted by California Policy Issues at [3:20 AM](#) No comments: 

Labels: [diversity](#), [George Mason U](#), [politics](#)

Lane Squeeze Near UCLA This Weekend

From the [Santa Monica Mirror](#):

Caltrans has announced an extended weekend of major lane reductions on Interstate 405 through the Sepulveda Pass, warning drivers to expect significant delays and urging them to use alternate routes or public transit.

Starting at 10:00 p.m. Friday, November 14, through 5:00 a.m. on Monday, November 17, the 405 will be reduced to three lanes in each direction for ongoing pavement rehabilitation work between Van Nuys and Westwood...



Full story at <https://smmirror.com/2025/11/caltrans-to-reduce-i-405-to-three-lanes-through-sepulveda-pass-november-14-17/>.

Posted by California Policy Issues at [3:05 AM](#) No comments: 

Labels: [traffic](#), [transportation](#), [UCLA](#)

[Newer Posts](#)

[Home](#)

[Older Posts](#)

Subscribe to: [Comments \(Atom\)](#)